

**REMARKS**

1. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the Examiner's comments, which have greatly assisted Applicant in responding.

5

2. 35 U.S.C. §102(e).

Claims 9-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yee, U.E. Patent No. 6,738,975.

10

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 9 appears as follows:

15

A method for routing messages from an application in an integrated framework, the framework comprising a centralized database and a plurality of Message-Oriented-Middleware (MOM) modules, at least one MOM module coupled to one of the plurality of applications and to the database and including an application adapter and a message adapter, the method comprising:

20

processing, by at least one MOM module, of the messages associated with the one of the plurality of applications to which the MOM module is coupled; and

controlling, in accordance with the centralized database, the distributed processing of the messages by the plurality of the MOM modules;

wherein the processing comprises:

25

sending a message from the application adapter to the message adapter, the message including a message identification and metadata;

responsive to receiving the message sent by the application adapter, querying the database with the message identification and the metadata; and

30

sending, by the message adapter to a message bus, the message with the queue manager and the queue name, wherein the queue manager and the queue name are obtained from the database.

A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found . . . in a single prior art reference. MPEP § 2131.

35

The Examiner relies on Yee's figure 4A as teaching "at least one MOM module coupled to one of the plurality of applications and to the database." Emphasis added.

In fact, the cited teaching does not describe a MOM module . . . attached to a database. Figure 4A does show an intelligent agent adapter, with the agent portion 210 in communication with the enterprise integration system, not the database. Figure 2 of Yee shows the interrelation of the elements in greater detail: the intelligent agent adapters 200 are connected to an integration server. Accordingly, there is no teaching in Yee of "at least one MOM module coupled to one of the plurality of applications and to the database."

The Examiner next relies on col. 18, lines 5-8 of Yee as teaching "sending a message from the first layer to the second layer, the message including a message identification and metadata . . ." Emphasis added. As the Examiner concedes, the cited teaching merely teaches that system messages are sent to other integration objects. Therefore, there is no teaching in Yee of a "message including a message identification and metadata."

The Examiner next relies on col. 18, lines 8-11 as teaching "responsive to receiving the message sent by the first layer, querying the database with the message identification and the metadata . . ." With respect, Applicant is mystified by the finding here. As the Examiner concedes, the cited teaching describes "A source adapter 622 extracts the data from a source enterprise application 510, constructs system messages from that data, and sends those system messages to other integration objects." Nowhere in this teaching is anything described that remotely resembles "querying the database with the message identification and the metadata . . ."

The Examiner next relies on Col. 18, lines 12-13 as teaching "sending, by the second layer to a message bus, the message with a queue manager and a queue name, wherein the queue manager and the queue name are obtained from the database." Emphasis added. As the Examiner concedes, the cited teaching actually describes "A target adapter 623 receives system messages from other integration objects 620, creates application data from those system messages . . ." Accordingly, there is no teaching in Yee of a message bus, a queue manager and a queue name, wherein the queue manager and queue name are obtained from the database."

Because Yee does not teach each and every element of the invention as set forth in claim 1, there is no anticipation. The current rejection is therefore improper. In view of its dependency from an allowable claim, claim 11 is deemed to be allowable without any further consideration of its merits.

**3. 35 U.S.C. §103(a).**

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yee.

- 5 Applicant respectfully disagrees. Because claim 1 describes an apparatus that substantially corresponds to the method described in claim 9, the remarks with respect to claim 9 apply equally to claim 1. Because there is no teaching or suggestion of the claimed invention in the combined teachings of the reference and the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, the current rejection of claim 1
- 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yee is deemed to be improper. In view of their dependency from an allowable base claim, claims 2-6 are deemed to be allowable without any further consideration of their merits.

- Because claim 7 shares elements with both claim 9 and claim 1, the above remarks apply equally to claim 7. Because there is no teaching or suggestion of the claimed
- 15 invention in the combined teachings of the reference and the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, the current rejection of claim 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yee is deemed to be improper. In view of its dependency from an allowable base claim, claim 8 is deemed to be allowable without any further consideration of its merits.

20

### CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Applicant considers the present invention to be distinguished  
5 from the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant earnestly solicits the Examiner's  
withdrawal of the rejections raised in the above referenced Office Action, such that a  
Notice of Allowance is forwarded to Applicant, and the present application is therefore  
allowed to issue as a United States patent. The Examiner is invited to call to discuss  
the response with Applicant's attorney or agent. The Commissioner is hereby  
10 authorized to charge any additional fees due or credit any overpayment to Deposit  
Account No. 07-1445.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
Christopher Peil

Reg. No. 45,005

25 Customer No. 22862